

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on May 11, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-2, 7, 9 and 19 have been amended and Claim 6 has been canceled, leaving Claims 1-5 and 7-19 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment. No new matter has been added by the amendments.

Support for Claim Amendments

The amendments to Claims 1, 9 and 19 are fully supported in Applicant's specification. See, for example, paragraph 28 in the specification. The amendment to Claim 7 was necessitated by the amendment to Claim 1. Claim 2 was amended to add the transition word "and" between the first and second clause.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-2, 9, 13-14, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0120504, to Bushnell (hereinafter "Bushnell"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because all of the elements in Claims 1-2, 9, 13-14, 17 and 19 are not found, either expressly or inherently described, in Bushnell.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "A method for providing a privacy management service in a telephone system by using originating calls to build a database of acceptable incoming calls, said method comprising: detecting a telephone call from a subscriber telephone number to a called party telephone number; determining if said called party telephone number is located in a subscriber database of telephone numbers corresponding to said subscriber telephone number; adding said called party telephone number to said subscriber database in response to said determining resulting in not locating said called party telephone number in said subscriber database, wherein incoming telephone calls to said subscriber telephone number from caller party telephone numbers located in the subscriber database are directly connected to the subscriber telephone number and incoming calls to said subscriber telephone number from caller

party telephone numbers not located in the subscriber database are transmitted to a screening application; and connecting said telephone call between said subscriber telephone number and said called party telephone number.” (Emphasis added.)

Bushnell teaches building a “click to favorites” directory based on incoming and outgoing calls made at a subscriber telephone number. When a subscriber is searching for a telephone number in a large telephone directory, telephone numbers that have been previously called by the subscriber or that have called the subscriber are highlighted. Alternatively, the only results displayed to the subscriber are the telephone numbers called by the subscriber or that have called the subscriber. (Bushnell; Abstract.) Bushnell teaches creating a directory of telephone numbers to make it easier for a subscriber to locate telephone numbers of people he has had previous telephone contact with.

Bushnell does not teach using originating calls from the subscriber to build a database of acceptable incoming calls as recited in amended Claim 1. Specifically, Bushnell does not teach “adding said called party telephone number to said subscriber database … wherein incoming telephone calls to said subscriber telephone number from caller party telephone numbers located in the subscriber database are directly connected to the subscriber telephone number and incoming calls to said subscriber telephone number from caller party telephone numbers not located in the subscriber database are transmitted to a screening application” as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Bushnell does not anticipate Claim 1 and Applicant submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Bushnell. Claim 2 depends from Claim 1 and is patentable at least due to its dependency on Claim 1. Claims 9 and 19 include similar elements as Claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is patentable. Claims 13-14 and 17 depend from Claim 9 and are patentable for at least due to their dependencies on Claim 9.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3-5 and 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bushnell as applied to Claim 1, 2 and 9 above, and further in view of Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0159574 to Stogel (hereinafter “Stogel”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because Bushnell in view of Stogel fails to teach or suggest all of the elements in Claims 3-5 and 10-11.

As stated above, Bushnell fails to disclose all of the elements of Claim 1, from which Claims 3-5 depend. In addition, Stogel fails to teach or suggest at least the elements “adding said called party telephone number to said subscriber database … wherein incoming telephone calls to said subscriber telephone number from caller party telephone numbers located in the subscriber database are directly connected to the subscriber telephone number and incoming calls to said subscriber telephone number from caller party telephone numbers not located in the subscriber database are transmitted to a screening application” as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Stogel does not cure the deficiencies of Bushnell with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, neither Bushnell nor Stogel, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 1. Applicants submit that Claims 3-5 are allowable at least due to their dependency on Claim 1. Further, because it contains elements that are similar to the elements in Claim 1, Applicants submit that neither Bushnell nor Stogel, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 9. Applicants further submit that Claims 10-11 are allowable at least due to their dependency on Claim 9.

Claims 15-16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bushnell as applied to Claim 9 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,455 to Weinman (hereinafter “Weinman”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because Bushnell in view of Weinman fails to teach or suggest all of the elements in Claims 15-16 and 18.

As stated above, Bushnell fails to disclose all of the elements of Claim 9, from which Claims 15-16 and 18 depend. In addition, Weinman fails to teach or suggest at least the elements “adds the called party number to the subscriber database … wherein incoming telephone calls to said subscriber telephone number from caller party telephone numbers located in the subscriber database are directly connected to the subscriber telephone number and incoming calls to said subscriber telephone number from caller party telephone numbers not located in the subscriber database are transmitted to a screening application” as recited in Claim 9. Therefore, Weinman does not cure the deficiencies of Bushnell with respect to Claim 9. Accordingly, neither Bushnell nor Weinman, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 9. Applicants submit that Claims 15-16 and 18 are allowable at least due to their dependency on Claim 9.

Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bushnell as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,569 to Pelletier (hereinafter “Pelletier”). Applicant submits that the rejection with regard to Claim 6 is moot because Claim 6 has been cancelled. In addition, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because Bushnell in view of Pelletier fails to teach or suggest all of the elements in Claim 7.

As stated above, Bushnell fails to disclose all of the elements of Claim 1, from which Claims 7 depends. In addition, Pelletier fails to teach or suggest at least the elements “adding said called party telephone number to said subscriber database … wherein incoming telephone calls to said subscriber telephone number from caller party telephone numbers located in the subscriber database are directly connected to the subscriber telephone number and incoming calls to said subscriber telephone number from caller party telephone numbers not located in the subscriber database are transmitted to a screening application” as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Pelletier does not cure the deficiencies of Bushnell with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, neither Bushnell nor Pelletier, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 1. Applicants submit that Claim 7 is allowable at least due to its dependency on Claim 1.

Claims 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bushnell and Pelletier as applied to Claim 7 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0096046 to Lection (hereinafter “Lection”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because Bushnell in view of Pelletier in further view of Lection fails to teach or suggest all of the elements in Claim 8.

As stated above, Bushnell in view of Pelletier fails to disclose all of the elements of Claim 7, from which Claim 8 depends. In addition, Lection fails to teach or suggest at least the elements “adding said called party telephone number to said subscriber database … wherein incoming telephone calls to said subscriber telephone number from caller party telephone numbers located in the subscriber database are directly connected to the subscriber telephone number and incoming calls to said subscriber telephone number from caller party telephone numbers not located in the subscriber database are transmitted to a screening application” as recited in Claim 7. Therefore, Lection does not cure the deficiencies of Bushnell in view of Pelletier with respect to Claim 7. Accordingly, neither Bushnell nor Pelletier nor Lection, alone

or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 7. Applicants submit that Claim 8 is allowable at least due to its dependency on Claim 7.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bushnell and Weinman as applied to Claim 10 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,944,184 to Miller (hereinafter “Miller”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because Bushnell in view of Weinman in further view of Miller fails to teach or suggest all of the elements in Claim 12.

As stated above, Bushnell in view of Wienman fails to disclose all of the elements of Claim 10, from which Claim 12 depends. In addition, Miller fails to teach or suggest at least the elements “adds the called party number to the subscriber database … wherein incoming telephone calls to said subscriber telephone number from caller party telephone numbers located in the subscriber database are directly connected to the subscriber telephone number and incoming calls to said subscriber telephone number from caller party telephone numbers not located in the subscriber database are transmitted to a screening application” as recited in Claim 10. Therefore, Miller does not cure the deficiencies of Bushnell in view of Weinman with respect to Claim 10. Accordingly, neither Bushnell nor Weinman nor Miller, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 10. Applicants submit that Claim 12 is allowable at least due to its dependency on Claim 10.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If any issues remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicant’s attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By:

Anne Davis Barry

Registration No. 47,408

CANTOR COLBURN

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone (860) 286-2929

Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Customer No. 36192

Customer No. 50192

Date: September 11, 2006